

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/605,237
Docket No.: 9758-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reynolds (US 20020104246A1). In addition, the Office Action rejected Claims 2-6, 8, 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Reynolds (US 20020104246A1) in view of Stout et al (US 006612874B1). Claims 7 & 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 1-13 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Summary of Applicant's Invention

The Applicant's invention is directed to an interface apparatus having a rotational mechanism for connecting with an interface port in an electronic product is provided. The interface apparatus has a body, a connector, and a rotational mechanism. The connector is used for connecting with the interface port of an electronic device. The rotational mechanism links up the body with the connector. The rotational mechanism has one to five degrees of freedom of movements. One or a multiple of rotational junctions together provides the degrees of freedom of movements in the rotational mechanism.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/605,237
Docket No.: 9758-US-PA

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

The Office Action rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reynolds (US 20020104246A1).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

The applicant's invention in Claim 1 discloses a "memory module" as defined in the description in Paragraph 7, Line 23 as ".... a non-volatile memory module" which could be interpreted as a memory device used typically in the computer and electronics industries. On the other hand, the word "memory" as used in Claim 1 of Reynolds (US 20020104246A1) quoted as follows: "..... the rotatable cantilever coupling comprising biasing structure with memory urging the frame from a displaced position to the neutral position." should carry the dictionary meaning of "the capacity of a material, such as plastic or metal, to return to a previous shape after deformation." Therefore, the "memory module" for the applicant's invention is not the same element as "...with memory ..." in Reynolds (US 20020104246A1). Furthermore, the same situation is demonstrated in Claim 17 in Reynolds, which is quoted as follows: "..... An assembly according to claim 16 wherein the biasing structure comprises a tongue comprising elastomeric synthetic resinous material comprising memory, the second electrical conductors being embedded in said material." In addition, it is demonstrated again in Claim 20 in Reynolds, which is quoted as follows: ".... An assembly according to claim 1 wherein the rotor of the coupling comprises a yieldable tongue comprising elastomeric material having

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/605,237
Docket No.: 9758-US-PA

memory" As a result, the applicant's invention is not anticipated by Reynolds, and Claim 1 should be allowed.

In addition, the Office Action rejected Claims 2-6, 8, 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Reynolds (US 20020104246A1) in view of Stout et al (US006612874B1).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Because the "memory module" as disclosed in the applicant's invention is not found in the Reynolds invention; therefore, Reynolds and Stout combined together are insufficient to form a 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection (since the Reynolds invention does not claim a "memory module"). Therefore, Claims 2-6, 8, 10-13 should be allowed.

Furthermore, Claims 7 & 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Since if the rejected base claims, namely Claims 6 & 8, were to be allowed instead, Claims 7 & 9 would then also be allowed.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-13 patently define over Reynolds, and therefore should be allowed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejections is respectfully requested.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/605,237
Docket No.: 9758-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-13 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: August 17, 2005

Respectfully submitted,


Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw

Page 5 of 5